

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, and 20-21 are presently examined on the merits. Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview granted on April 10, 2003 (hereinafter the "Interview").

The Office Action dated March 24, 2003 (hereinafter the "Office Action") was discussed in the Interview, and agreement was reached as to some of the issues raised in the Office Action, as set forth in the Interview Summary dated April 11, 2003. No further remarks concerning such issues are provided herein because they are presently moot. This response refers to matters that were characterized in the same Interview Summary as necessitating further attention, and Applicants address such matters according to the guidance provided in the Interview Summary

Applicants address below the claim rejections asserted in the Office Action. Citations and supportive authority referred to in prior response(s) are incorporated herein, but they not repeated hereinbelow to concisely present these Remarks.

Claims 1, 20, and 21 have been amended to clarify their language. As discussed in the Interview, the language concerning the reaction well has been changed from "entities that result from the interaction" to -the reaction products-, as another way of indicating that the claimed subject matter is not to be limited only to the unreacted and simultaneous presence in the well of the substances listed in the relevant parts of the claims.

As discussed in the Interview, no further clarification is deemed necessary regarding the language of step (b) in independent claims 1, 20, and 21. Therefore, no further remarks are provided regarding this matter.

Claim 14 has been amended as discussed in the Interview. The present language should therefore provide the clarification as addressed in the Interview.

The amendments herein introduced, in addition to the supportive reasons and showings of the standard use of relevant terminology in this technology, as discussed in the

Serial No. 09/599,877

Interview, should place the claims in conditions for allowance. Removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

A Declaration by Dr. Dirk Edward Désiré Jochmans (hereinafter the "Declaration") accompanies the present Response. This Declaration addresses the matters as set forth in the Interview, including (a) the measurement of higher resistance levels according to the presently claimed methodologies, (b) characteristics of single-well multiple chain termination event performance according to the presently claimed methodologies, and (c) characteristics of resistance testing for RTS with a plurality of reactions in a single well according to the presently claimed methodologies. This Declaration also addresses what appear to be conflicting reports in this field.

Applicants reassert, in the context of the additional support provided by this Declaration, the arguments concerning the nonobviousness of the present claims, and respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be removed.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



By:

Jesús Juanós i Timoneda, PhD
Reg. No. 43,332

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-1513
Dated: September 22, 2003